UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
30th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 11 November 1992
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 30th MEETING

Chairman:	Mr. PATOKALLIO (Vice-Chairman)	(Finland)
later:	Mr. ELARABY (Chairman)	(Egypt)

CONTENTS

- Consideration of draft resolutions under all disarmament and international security items (continued)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/47/PV.30
4 December 1992

ENGLISH

92-61822 2730V (E)

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Patokallio (Finland), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 4.35 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 49 to 65, 68 and 142; 67 and 69 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Sri Lanka, who will introduce the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean (A/47/29).

Mr. KALPAGE (Sri Lanka): I have the honour to introduce the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean (A/47/29). The report is in three sections: introduction; work of the Ad Hoc Committee in 1992; and conclusion.

The General Assembly, by its resolution 46/49, noted

"with satisfaction the preparatory work done by the Ad Hoc Committee in the implementation of the mandate entrusted to it for the convening of the Conference [on the Indian Ocean]". (resolution 46/49, para. 4)

The General Assembly decided that

"the Conference should be structured in more than one stage" (para. 5).

It also decided to

"convene the first stage of the Conference at Colombo in 1993, or as soon as possible, in accordance with the present resolution and in consultation with the host country" (para. 6)

- Sri Lanka.

The General Assembly called for

"the full and active participation in the Conference of the permanent members of the Security Council and the major maritime users of the Indian Ocean, whose cooperation and participation are essential for the success of the Conference". (para. 8)

(Mr. Kalpagé, Sri Lanka)

The General Assembly also decided that the Ad Hoc Committee would hold a session of five working days in 1992 to perform its preparatory functions for the various stages envisaged for the Conference. In accordance with the terms of this mandate, the Ad Hoc Committee held a session of five working days, from 18 to 22 May 1992, at United Nations Headquarters in New York.

Prior to that session, at the request of the officers of the Ad Hoc Committee, I held consultations with the three permanent members of the Security Council which had withdrawn from the Committee, and with several major maritime users of the Indian Ocean which did not participate in its work, regarding their full participation in the Conference, and I reported to the Committee. The full text of my statement is contained in the annex to the report of the Ad Hoc Committee.

During its deliberations, the Ad Hoc Committee took note of my report, in which I, inter alia, reported on my consultations with three permanent members of the Security Council and with some of the major maritime users of the Indian Ocean, in the course of which they conveyed the view that they would not find it possible to participate in a Conference based on the 1971 Declaration.

In view of those facts, the Committee felt that it might not be possible to hold the Conference at Colombo in 1993 in accordance with resolution 46/49.

The Ad Hoc Committee agreed on the importance of the establishment of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace to achieve the goals contained in 1971 Declaration and as considered at the Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean held in July 1979.

(Mr. Kalpagé, Sri Lanka)

The Committee was therefore of the view that the General Assembly might wish

"to consider alternative approaches to achieve the objectives of resolution 46/49." (A/47/29, para. 14)

The Ad Hoc Committee recalled that it was the Lusaka Summit of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries in September 1970 which led to the 1971 Declaration on the Indian Ocean. In this connection, the Ad Hoc Committee thought it appropriate for its Chairman to report on developments to the tenth Summit Conference of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

The Ad Hoc Committee felt that its Chairman should continue to conduct informal consultations with the permanent members of the Security Council, the major maritime users of the Indian Ocean and the members of the Ad Hoc Committee.

I might add that I reported on the developments in the Ad Hoc Committee to the tenth Summit Conference of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Jakarta. In its Final Document the Conference indicated the position of the Non-Aligned Movement regarding the importance of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean and recommended that the Ad Hoc Committee should continue to work on new alternative approaches to realizing its goal.

A draft resolution for consideration by the First Committee will be presented shortly. Every endeavour will be made to obtain a consensus both among members of the Ad Hoc Committee and among those Members who are not at present participating in its work. It is my earnest hope that the consideration of new alternative approaches to achieve the goals of the

(Mr. Kalpagé, Sri Lanka)

General Assembly will facilitate the participation of all the permanent members of the Security Council and the major maritime users of the Indian Ocean in the future work of the Ad Hoc Committee as entrusted to it by the General Assembly.

Ms. MASON (Canada): I refer this afternoon to agenda item 52, on verification in all its aspects.

In resolution 45/65 the General Assembly adopted by consensus the report of the Group of Qualified Governmental Experts to Undertake a Study on the Role of the United Nations in the Field of Verification. Among the recommendations of that report was the development of a United Nations

> "consolidated data bank of published materials and data provided on a voluntary basis by Member States on all aspects of verification and compliance." (A/45/372, annex, para. 263)

Last year Canada conveyed to the United Nations an electronically readable version - that is, a computer disk - of the Canadian publication entitled Bibliography on Arms Control Verification: 1962-1991. Hard copies - that is, printed texts - were also made available here to Member States. Since that time a considerable amount of new literature on the subject of verification has appeared. As part of Canada's continuing support for the experts' study, it gives me great pleasure to state today that we have prepared an update of the earlier bibliography. This update, which follows the same format as the earlier document, contains over 800 new entries.

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

As was true concerning the original bibliography, our intention in providing it is to give further assistance to the United Nations in its efforts to set up a consolidated verification data base. We also hope that the bibliography will assist officials, diplomats and researchers in their work on this subject. For this reason we will be distributing the hard-copy version widely within the First Committee and outside the United Nations. Copies of the text are available in this Conference Room.

Finally, as I have said in the past when speaking to the First Committee, I urge other Member States with relevant experience in the field of verification to make similar contributions. The usefulness of the United Nations consolidated data bank will be determined in large measure by the support it receives from Members.

The CHAIRMAN: I call next on the representative of the United Kingdom, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.8.

Sir Michael WESTON (United Kingdom): Before speaking on behalf of the United Kingdom to introduce, on behalf of its sponsors, the draft resolution entitled "Guidelines and recommendations for objective information on military matters" (A/C.1/47/L.8), I should like to make a statement on nuclear matters on behalf of the European Community and its member States.

In the statement I delivered on behalf of the European Community and its member States in the general debate, on 12 October, I noted that nuclear disarmament continues to be one of the highest priorities of the Community and its member States in the field of arms control and disarmament. I also set out our common positions on many aspects of this subject. I should also recall that earlier this year we introduced into Working Group II of the Disarmament Commission a working paper containing an extensive statement of our views on nuclear issues. Today I should like to make some additional remarks which reflect our common views on some of the draft resolutions on nuclear issues which have been put before us.

We have have all noticed, and welcomed, the excellent atmosphere in the Committee this year and the continued development of the trend of recent years towards compromise. One of the most important manifestations of this spirit this year has been the successful negotiation of a single draft resolution text on "Bilateral nuclear arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament" (A/C.1/47/L.36). Those of us who have been involved in attempts to produce a single text in previous years know what a significant breakthrough this represents. We confidently look forward to its adoption without a vote.

The draft resolution welcomes an impressive list of achievements: the continued implementation of the Treaty on the elimination of

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles (INF Treaty); the signing of the Treaty on the Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (START Treaty) and its Lisbon Protocol; the unilateral decisions on further significant reductions, on the elimination of certain nuclear weapons and on the enhancement of stability; and the Joint Understanding on substantial further reductions, and the agreement to turn this also into a formal treaty.

These developments will lead to a considerable enhancement of international peace and security, and we hope they will be implemented under the best possible conditions of safety and transparency.

However, the draft resolution also recognizes that much will have to be done to bring all these important elements to fruition. The adoption of this resolution by the General Assembly will offer the two Member States - the Russian Federation and the United States of America - the full encouragement and support of the membership of the United Nations in this task. The Community and its member States share in offering this encouragement, and our support includes not only moral but also practical aspects, for example our involvement in the establishment of the International Science and Technology Centre in Russia.

The two members of the Community which are nuclear-weapon States have also made a meaningful contribution to the process of nuclear disarmament, in particular by making reductions in some of their nuclear-weapon programmes as described in recent national statements.

This year sees two draft resolutions on the question of nuclear testing, A/C.1/47/L.37 and L.38. While the member States of the European Community

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

have differing views on these draft resolutions, we note with attention the evolution of thinking on these issues which has taken place in the recent past, including the current moratoriums on nuclear testing which have been put into effect by several nuclear-weapon States, as well as the recent proposal by the Foreign Minister of France that the representatives of the five nuclear-weapon States to the Conference on Disarmament, in Geneva, should consult on nuclear-testing issues. We believe that nuclear-test-ban issues should continue to be actively addressed and to be given priority in the Conference on Disarmament, in Geneva. On the other hand, we are not convinced that it would be opportune to reconvene the Partial Test Ban Treaty Amendment Conference at this time and we shall not, therefore, be able to support draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.38.

In the context of the bilateral process I mentioned the Lisbon Protocol. In this regard also the Community and its member States attach particular importance to early adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) as non-nuclear weapon States by Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan, and the removal of all nuclear weapons from their territory.

We welcome the accessions to the Non-Proliferation Treaty since this time last year by China and France; their accession means that all five nuclear-weapon States are now parties. We also welcome the accession by Azerbaijan, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Namibia, Niger, Slovenia and Uzbekistan, bringing the total membership to 154 States. We hope that this trend will continue and that the goal of universal adherence will soon be achieved.

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

The Community and its member States welcome the successful outcome of the meeting of States Parties to the NPT, held on 22 October under the skilful chairmanship of Mr. Ibanez of Peru, which took the necessary decisions related to the establishment of a Preparatory Committee for the 1995 Conference of the Treaty. It now remains to adopt the related draft resolution in document A/C.1/47/L.6.

Once again the Committee has before it a series of draft resolutions on nuclear-weapon-free zones. The Community and its Member States consider such zones, when they are supported by all States of the region and embodied through appropriate treaties, including provision for full-scope IAEA safeguards, as an important contribution to global and regional security. We particularly welcome the initiative of the African States recorded in draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.14 to draw up a draft treaty or convention on the denuclearization of Africa. We similarly welcome the news that significant steps have been taken towards bringing the Treaty of Tlatelolco into force for the whole zone of application, including ratification by France of Additional Protocol I, and we shall support draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.40, which encourages this process.

We welcome the fact that draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.11 is once again likely to achieve consensus and express the hope that the States involved will soon start substantive negotiations to bring the idea of a Middle East nuclear-weapon-free-zone Treaty into formal reality. Similarly we support the idea of a treaty to confer legally binding nuclear-free status upon the area of South Asia. Here too we would welcome the involvement of all States of the region in appropriate discussions.

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

I should now like to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/47/L.8, entitled "Guidelines and recommendations for objective information on military matters".

This draft resolution is sponsored by Austria, Brazil, Cameroon, Costa Rica, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Japan, Malaysia, Nepal, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Peru, Romania, Sweden, the United Kingdom and Uruguay.

It was in 1988 that the United Kingdom first introduced a draft resolution to this Committee on the subject of objective information on military matters. That draft resolution invited Member States to communicate their views on the subject to the Secretary-General. The following year we introduced a draft resolution asking the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC) to consider the question.

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

The introduction of this new agenda item coincided with the reforms in the United Nations Disarmament Commission, and it became the first item given a fixed term of three years for completion. We are pleased that this first experiment with the new procedures has turned out so successfully.

In the first year of consideration Ambassador Hohenfellner of Austria presided over the Working Group and stimulated a lively and well-focused debate on the issues related to use of objective information. Ambassador Erdös of Hungary took up the baton in the second year and was able to collect and collate a wide range of textual proposals. This year Ambassador Hyltenius of Sweden, who had perhaps the hardest task, turned this raw material into a single coherent document, which commanded consensus in the Commission. We offer our warm thanks to all three for their skilful and hard work and to all delegations on the Disarmament Commission for the true spirit of compromise which was manifest.

The draft resolution which we are proposing this year is largely procedural; it is primarily intended to provide the Guidelines and Recommendations for Objective Information on Military Matters with the endorsement of the General Assembly. The language of the draft reflects that of the Guidelines themselves where appropriate.

I should perhaps explain that the deadline of 31 May 1994 for providing relevant information to the Secretary-General is not intended to prevent subsequent communications. It is simply that, for practical reasons, the Secretariat will need to receive by then any contributions which are to be incorporated in the report which the Secretary-General is to submit to the forty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

The sponsors hope that, just as the Disarmament Commission adopted the Guidelines and Recommendations for Objective Information on Military Matters by consensus, draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.8 can be adopted without a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Mexico, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.38.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.38 comes under agenda item 53, "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water".

Three of the nuclear-weapon States have unilaterally decided to observe moratoriums on nuclear testing. This is an important step that allows us to glimpse the beginning of the end of nearly a half century of testing, first in the atmosphere and then underground. The 1963 partial test-ban Treaty was an important landmark in the search for a comprehensive test-ban, a goal we are today approaching.

In the nearly 30 years since the signing of the partial test-ban Treaty the international community has explored innumerable paths to achieve, in the words of the Treaty's preamble,

> "the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time" (ENDC/100/Rev.1, p. 1).

Year after year the General Assembly has urged nuclear-weapon States to proceed to the negotiation of a comprehensive test-ban treaty and has urged the Conference on Disarmament to establish an ad hoc committee on the matter. The Conference on Disarmament has done so sporadically, while avoiding the word "negotiation" in the ad hoc committee's mandate. For their part, the partial test-ban Treaty Depositary Governments have held trilateral and,

(Mr. Marín Bosch, Mexico)

sometimes, bilateral consultations. For a number of years the Conference on Disarmament has convened a group of expert seismologists to consider some aspects of the verification of a possible comprehensive test-ban treaty.

But we are still without a comprehensive test-ban treaty. That is why a group of six countries have taken the initiative of convening, in accordance with the provisions of the 1963 Treaty, a conference of the Parties to that Treaty to consider a proposed amendment to turn it into a permanent, comprehensive test-ban treaty. That initiative received broad support, and in January 1991 a substantive session of the Amendment Conference was held. Since then, the President of the Amendment Conference, the Foreign Minister of Indonesia, Mr. Ali Alatas, has been holding consultations.

Today I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.38 on agenda item 53, entitled "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water", sponsored by the delegations of Bahamas, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, India, Indonesia, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela and Mexico.

In the draft, the General Assembly notes the ongoing consultations being conducted by the President of the Amendment Conference. In order to evaluate the situation and ensure coordination between the Amendment Conference and the Geneva Conference on Disarmament, a brief - I emphasize "brief" - meeting of States parties will be held in the second quarter of 1993. The draft also

> "Calls upon all parties to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water to participate in, and to contribute to the success of, the Amendment Conference for the achievement of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban at an early date, as an

(Mr. Marín Bosch, Mexico)

indispensable measure towards implementation of their undertakings in the preamble to the Treaty". (A/C.1/47/L.38, para. 2)

The sponsors of draft resolution L.38 are convinced that the amendment process for the partial test-ban Treaty offers an opportunity that the international community must not let pass. We express the hope that the members of the First Committee will give the draft resolution their support and by so doing indicate their determination to explore whatever path may be open to them to achieve a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Togo, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.26/Rev.1.

Mr. PENNANEACH (Togo)(interpretation from French): It is a great privilege for me to introduce, on behalf of the Chairman of the Group of African States and the sponsors from other regional Groups, draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.26/Rev.1, "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa, United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific and United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean".

The draft resolution, which is submitted under agenda item 62, "Review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly", is sponsored by the States Members that are members of the Group of African States, the States Members that are members of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States and 14 States of Asia and the Pacific: Bangladesh, China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Viet Nam.*

---

* The Chairman took the Chair.

(Mr. Pennaneach, Togo)

Set up in 1986, 1987 and 1989, respectively, the United Nations Regional Centres were given the primary role of giving States, upon request, functional support for their initiatives and efforts aimed at carrying out activities in favour of peace, disarmament and arms limitation. Thus the Centres have been disseminating information on peace, disarmament, security and development to Governments, students, researchers and to any individuals or legal entities interested in disarmament and development. They have also organized many seminars, held conferences and undertaken studies.

On 15 March 1991, the Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa, based in Lomé, Togo, began a research project on border problems within the framework of activities related to the maintenance of peace and security in Africa. The first stage of this project, which has been concluded, consisted of research and documentation work by five researchers over a period of a year on border questions in the five African subregions: North Africa, southern Africa, Central Africa, East Africa and the Horn of Africa, and West Africa. Thereafter, the Centre organized an international seminar, during which 30 experts examined, studied and adopted the report of the five researchers.

The second stage of the project, which has not yet begun owing to lack of adequate resources, will include setting up in each African subregion a training programme for the peaceful settlement of border disputes that have been identified and discussed in the researchers' report.

Senior officials and other personalities likely to play a positive role in the settlement of border conflicts in Africa will benefit from such training. This second phase will start up as soon as financial conditions allow.

(Mr. Pennaneach, Togo)

All useful information about the life and programme of activity of the three Regional Centres is contained in the Secretary-General's report, document A/47/359 of 21 September 1992. A study of that report will show that the adopted programmes are rather ambitious and require significant resources in order to be implemented.

But as members know, the financial situation of the Centres in recent years has been a matter of concern and has compelled them to work at a slow pace despite the willingness and the dedication of those in charge. The Centres were set up on the basis of existing resources and voluntary contributions. At this stage, however, those so-called existing resources are not really available, and voluntary contributions are rather rare or, at the very least, come in at a trickle. But the Regional Centres are the external services of the United Nations, especially the Office of Disarmament Affairs, of which they are an integral part. As they are working to promote peace, security, disarmament and development, should they not survive at least as long as the United Nations?

The General Assembly adopted resolution 46/37 F on 9 December 1991. In that resolution the Assembly, while appealing for voluntary contributions from States, organizations and foundations, it decided that, to ensure the continued financial viability of the Regional Centres, their administrative costs would be financed from the regular budget, so as to enable them fully and effectively to face their responsibilities and discharge their role.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.26/Rev.1, which I am now introducing, was worked out on the basis of the elements I have mentioned. It is the result of a long series of consultations, and in paragraph 4 merely calls for the full implementation of resolution 46/37 F, on which it is based.

(Mr. Pennaneach, Togo)

In making this request, the sponsors hope that differences will be ironed out and, hence, ask representatives to note that the full implementation of last year's resolution is an absolute requirement, since there has been no improvement in the financial situation of the Centres - a situation that has even worsened in some cases despite praiseworthy efforts on the part of the Governments of States that have offered to host these institutions.

In view of the foregoing, the sponsors would like, through me, to invite delegations in the Committee to be more mindful of the problem of Regional Centres, which in fact are our own tools to promote peace, security, disarmament and development on the national, subregional and regional levels. They hope that their appeal will be heeded.

Given the importance of the subject, the sponsors are fully prepared to continue consultations and study any constructive proposal aiming at ensuring the adoption of this draft resolution by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Kenya, who will introduce draft resolutions A/C.1/47/L.13 and L.14.

Mr. AMBEYI-LIGABO (Kenya): On behalf of Mauritius, Chairman of the African Group for the month of November, the delegation of Kenya has asked to speak to introduce two draft resolutions: draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.14, under agenda item 59, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa"; and draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.13, under agenda item 61 (k), entitled "Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes".

Members will recall that 28 years ago in Cairo the African Heads of State adopted a Declaration on the need for the denuclearization of Africa. It is

(Mr. Ambeyi-Ligabo, Kenya)

in pursuance of this noble aim and objective, and also as part of our effort at general and complete disarmament, that draft resolution L.14 is brought before the Committee.

In preparing draft resolution L.14, we considered several reports, among them the report of the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), as well as the Agency's resolution GC(XXXVI)/RES/577 on South Africa's nuclear capabilities, adopted on 25 September 1992 by its General Conference. We considered the report of the group of experts to examine the modalities and elements for the preparation and implementation of a convention or a treaty on the denuclearization of Africa, set up jointly by the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations, which met at Lomé from 28 to 30 April 1992.

We also took into consideration the views of various delegations - in particular members of the European Economic Community and other Western countries - which they expressed last year.

(Mr. Ambeyi-Ligabo, Kenya)

The African Group has held extensive consultations with many delegations with regard to both draft resolutions A/C.1/47/L.14 and A/C.1/47/L.13.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.14 merges into one text part A and part B of last year's draft resolution. The developments that have enabled us to merge the two parts are reflected in the reports I mentioned earlier and also in the African desire to move to the next important stage: drafting the treaty or convention and then implementing the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa.

In view of this positive convergence of views on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.14, the African Group believes that the evolution of the international situation is conducive to the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. We are also convinced that the drafting of the convention or treaty and the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa will be an important step towards the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the promotion of international peace and security.

In paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.14, we commend the Secretary-General for the diligence with which he has rendered effective assistance to the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in organizing the meetings of the group of experts. On the same note, we wish to thank Mr. Davinic, the Acting Director of the Office for Disarmament Affairs, and Mr. Ogunbanwo, of the same Office, for providing valuable advice to this group of experts, entrusted with the task of preparing elements for a treaty or convention on the denuclearization of Africa. We hope they will continue to play that role.

(Mr. Ambeyi-Ligabo, Kenya)

We ask delegations, in considering this draft resolution, to weigh the cost of just one more meeting of the group of experts to finalize the drafting of the treaty or convention against the benefit that will be achieved in terms of our overall disarmament efforts. We wish to place it on record that the cost of one extra meeting will not be more than that of the meeting held last year, and we are convinced that this one extra meeting will give us ample time to finalize our draft treaty or covention on the denuclearization of Africa.

The overwhelming majority of nations desire a world free of nuclear weapons. We all strive for total nuclear disarmament, the elimination of nuclear weapons from the Earth's surface. It is in this spirit of disarmament that the African Group wishes to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.14, which is on an issue of special significance to our continent, and we hope that the Committee will adopt it withour a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.13 has almost all the elements that are contained in resolution 46/36 K of 1991. While preparing draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.13, we took note of resolution GC(XXXIV)/RES/530 of the International Atomic Energy Agency, which established a Code of Practice on the International Transboundary Movement of Radioactive Waste. We also took note of resolution CM/Res.1356 (LIV) of 1991 of the OAU Council of Ministers, on the Bamako Convention on the Ban on the Import of Hazardous Wastes into Africa.

The majority of African States do not have the appropriate technology for the quick detection, identification or differentiation of the waste that is being dumped into our continent. The Committee is also aware that most of the companies that deal in this unscrupulous business are not under the control of

(Mr. Ambeyi-Ligabo, Kenya)

the Governments of their country of origin, and there is therefore a tendency for them to mislabel certain consignments. When they are radioactive, for example, they can mislabel them in another fashion to make it possible to dump them in a country. It is on this premise that African States condemn and oppose any dumping of any kind of waste, not only radioactive, but all kinds of waste that are injurious or harmful to populations or the environment. This is a sensitive matter for all African delegations, for we believe any dumping will definitely have grave implications for the national security of States - not only African States, but all States.

The African Group has taken note of the concern of some delegations with regard to paragraph 3. While we are working hard to achieve the same consensus on this draft resolution as was achieved on the relevant draft resolution in 1991, we hope that other delegations will take note of our sensitivity on this issue, and we hope something reasonable will emerge that can accommodate all of us.

Finally, we urge all Member States to support this draft resolution so that we may adopt it without a vote as was the case last year for the relevant draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to remind members that, in accordance with the programme of work and the timetable, the Committee will proceed to take action tomorrow, Thursday, 12 November, in the morning, on the following draft resolution in cluster 1:

A/C.1/47/L.1/Rev.2, L.3, L.5, L.6, L.7, L.8, L.10, L.16, L.18, L.20/Rev.1, L.21, L.23, L.24, L.27, L.28/Rev.1, L.30, L.39, and L.42/Rev.1.

I should like to inform members that the Committee will take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.4, entitled "Report of the Disarmament

(The Chairman)

Commission", at a later stage. I have been informed by the Chairman of the United Nations Disarmament Commission that the sponsors of the draft resolution have requested more time for further consultations.

If time permits, following the conclusion of action on cluster 1, the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 2. Thereafter it will be my intention to move, in so far as possible, sequentially from one cluster to another upon the conclusion of action on each cluster.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that the following States have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions:

A/C.1/47/L.4:	Armenia;
A/C.1/47/L.11:	Armenia;
A/C.1/47/L.15:	Nepal, New Zealand, Samoa, Nigeria and Argentina;
A/C.1/47/L.18:	Armenia, Bolivia and Moldova;
A/C.1/47/L.20/Rev.1:	Bolivia and Honduras;
A/C.1/47/L.22:	Bolivia, Moldova and Samoa;
A/C.1/47/L.23:	Armenia;
A/C.1/47/L.24:	Armenia, Paraguay and Qatar;
A/C.1/47/L.25:	Armenia;
A/C.1/47/L.26:	Bolivia;
A/C.1/47/L.27:	Armenia;

(Mr. Kheradi)

A/C.1/47/L.29:	Armenia and the Republic of Moldova;
A/C.1/47/L.30:	Armenia;
A/C.1/47/L.35:	Armenia, Slovenia, Romania and the Republic of Moldova;
A/C.1/47/L.36:	Armenia;
A/C.1/47/L.37:	Slovenia, Luxembourg, Portugal and Spain;
A/C.1/47/L.38:	Bolivia;
A/C.1/47/L.42/Rev.1:	Armenia, Denmark, Slovenia and Romania.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.

UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
31st meeting
held on
Thursday, 12 November 1992
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 31st MEETING

Chairman:	Mr. ELARABY	(Egypt)
later:	Mr. PATOKALLIO (Vice-Chairman)	(Finland)
later:	Mr. ELARABY (Chairman)	(Egypt)

CONTENTS

- Action on draft resolutions under all disarmament items

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

92-61828 2740V (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/47/PV.31
18 December 1992

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11.10 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 49 to 65, 68 and 142 (continued)

ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: I first call on the Secretary of the Committee who wishes to make a statement.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I would like to bring to the attention of the members of the First Committee the text of a communication which has been addressed to me in my capacity as Secretary of the First Committee by the Secretary of the Fifth Committee. The substantive part of that communication reads as follows:

"As you know, the General Assembly allocated agenda item 105, 'Programme planning', to the Fifth Committee. It also decided to submit the relevant programmes of the proposed revisions to the medium-term plan 1992-1997 to the plenary or to the appropriate Main Committees for review, on the understanding that the views of the plenary or the Main Committees would be transmitted to the Fifth Committee in order that they may be considered in conjunction with the Committee's consideration of this item.

"The Fifth Committee has started its review of this item today" - that is, 11 November. "However, it has to receive the views of your Committee in order to continue with its deliberation. You are therefore kindly requested to bring the matter to the immediate attention of your Committee so that a letter from the Chairman of your Committee transmitting the Committee's views is received soonest."

You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that you already brought the matter related to programme planning under agenda item 105 to the attention of the

(Mr. Kheradi)

Committee at its second meeting on 8 October 1992. Accordingly, the Committee is seized of the issue already.

Nevertheless, in view of the urgency of the matter, as referred to in the communication that has been received, I thought it advisable to refer to this issue once again.

The CHAIRMAN: In accordance with the Committee's programme of work and timetable, this morning the Committee will proceed to begin action on draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament agenda items, namely items 49 to 65, 68 and 142.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions which appear in cluster 1, namely draft resolutions A/C.1/47/L.1/Rev.2, L.3, L.5, L.6, L.7, L.8, L.10, L.16, L.18, L.20/Rev.1, L.21, L.23, L.24, L.27, L.28/Rev.1, L.30, L.39 and L.42/Rev.1.

Before proceeding to the stage of taking action on draft resolutions, I would like once more to remind members of the Committee of the following procedure to be observed during this stage of the work of the Committee.

As far as action on each individual cluster is concerned, delegations will first of all have the opportunity to introduce draft resolutions under that cluster. Following that, delegations will have an opportunity to make any statement other than explanation of their positions or votes which they regard as necessary with respect to the draft resolutions in that particular cluster. Subsequently, delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes on any or all of the draft resolutions in a particular cluster before a decision is taken would do so.

Then, after the Committee has taken a decision on the draft resolutions contained in a given cluster, delegations wishing to explain their positions

(The Chairman)

or votes after the decision is taken would do so. I would request delegations to make a consolidated statement on draft resolutions contained in an individual cluster, with respect to the statements and explanations of vote concerned.

I wish to emphasize that, in order to avoid any misunderstanding, I urge those delegations wishing to ask for a recorded vote on any particular draft resolution kindly to inform the Secretariat of their intention as soon as possible, but certainly prior to our proceeding to take action on an individual cluster. I hope the voting procedure is clear.

Before the Committee proceeds to take decisions on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, I shall now call on delegations wishing to make statements other than explanations of their positions on those draft resolutions.

Mr. TANAKA (Japan): As regards the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/47/L.5, Japan is pleased to note that there seems to be a common agreement on the need to promote expertise in disarmament among public officials, particularly in developing countries. The objectives of the United Nations Disarmament Fellowship, Training and Advisory Services Programme have been successfully achieved with the help of the people and countries that have supported it.

I see the faces of many colleagues here in this Committee who, in the past, participated in the Programme. My warm congratulations go particularly to Mr. Ogunbanwo, who has carried out the very important tasks of coordinating the Programme from its very beginning and has contributed greatly to its success.

(Mr. Tanaka, Japan)

Japan is pleased to have been a host country. Over the past decades, more than 270 fellows have visited Hiroshima and Nagasaki, two cities whose experiences have shaped Japan's disarmament policy. I wish to assure this Committee of the willingness of the Japanese Government to continue to cooperate with this Fellowship Programme.

Mr. AL-NASSER (Qatar) (interpretation from Arabic): I am speaking on behalf of the Group of Arab States before we take action on the draft resolution before the First Committee in document A/C.1/47/L.1/Rev.2, concerning the chemical weapons Convention.

The Arab States' support for the objectives and purposes of the chemical weapons Convention, stems from our support of the initiative for making the Middle East a zone free from weapons of mass destruction. We welcome the formulation of that legal instrument, the prime goal of which is to eliminate an entire category of weapons of mass destruction.

(Mr. Al-Nasser, Qatar)

The Arab countries, members of the Conference on Disarmament, have participated, with sincerity and in good faith, in the negotiations aimed at elaborating the Convention. Despite the shared reservations of several developing countries regarding certain provisions in the Convention, we have no objection to the Convention per se. The aim of the reservations voiced by those countries was to make the Convention's provisions as hermetic as possible and thereby guarantee its proper implementation in a manner that takes into account the interests of the Arab and other developing countries.

In the light of the prevalent political and security circumstances in the Middle East, a global and comprehensive approach should be adopted in dealing with issues of arms control in the region. This means that all the dimensions of the problem should be addressed and that all types of weapons of mass destruction and every weapons system should be dealt with without excepting any State or any weapons system. Otherwise the security situation will worsen rather than improve, because national security is indivisible.

In the light of the foregoing and in view of the facts on the ground in the Middle East, it behooves the Arab countries to deal with the chemical weapons Convention in parallel with Israel's position on the NPT and with its response to the international call to place all its nuclear installations under the international safeguards and inspection regime.

The Arab States will not obstruct the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.1/Rev.2, but in the meantime our position should not be interpreted as participation in adopting the resolution on this issue.

Mr. MUNKH-ORGIL (Mongolia): The First Committee is about to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.5, "United Nations Disarmament

(Mr. Munkh-Orgil, Mongolia)

Fellowship, Training and Advisory Services Programme", which my delegation has the honour to co-sponsor.

Mongolia, along with many other countries, has been given an opportunity to participate in the activities organized within the framework of the United Nations Disarmament Fellowship Programme.

We are gratified to note that the Programme has proven to be useful in further promoting expertise in disarmament among the public officials of many countries, in particular the developing ones. More than 300 officials from 120 States participated in the United Nations Disarmament Fellowship Programme and they now occupy positions of responsibility in the field of disarmament affairs in their respective countries or Governments.

My delegation wishes to acknowledge the commendable efforts exerted by the Secretariat, in particular by the Senior Coordinator Mr. Ogunbanwo, in successfully carrying out the Programme over the years.

The beginning of the actual process of disarmament, the increasing recognition of the value of the multilateral disarmament bodies, as well as the growing complexity of the issues discussed there, make the assistance provided by the Programme even more useful and attractive.

We hope that the Programme will continue to enjoy the support of Member States and continue to be implemented in the future.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their position before decisions are taken on all the draft resolutions in cluster 1.

Mr. YATIV (Israel): Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.1/Rev.2, I wish to say that the region of the Middle East has known the threat and use of chemical weapons. Elimination of such weapons everywhere, and especially in the Middle East, has been considered by Israel to be of supreme importance. In recent years, we have on several occasions called for the establishment in the Middle East of a region free from chemical weapons.

In that spirit, Israel has supported the goals of the draft Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction. Israel also decided to join the sponsors of the draft resolution and to become an original signatory to the Convention as a further expression of the importance which it attaches to the Convention.

However, we hope that the universality of the Convention will be duly guaranteed and that all countries of the region will adhere to the Convention and fulfil its obligations. We also hope that the election mechanism for representation in the bodies to be set up under the Convention will guarantee the right of all members to election to the governing bodies of the Convention.

Furthermore, in the volatile region of the Middle East it is also essential to guarantee that in its implementation the Convention will not be abused.

As several States in the region are still arming themselves with chemical weapons, it is our fervent hope that this multilateral Convention will be instrumental in eradicating all chemical weapons from the Middle East.

As regards draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.6, concerning the non-proliferation Treaty, Israel supports the establishment of the Preparatory Committee scheduled to meet in May 1993. Israel also supports the principle

(Mr. Yativ, Israel)

of non-proliferation of nuclear arms and voted in favour of the non-proliferation Treaty when it received the blessing of the General Assembly. Israel believes that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, freely negotiated between the States of the region, with provision for mutual verification, is the most reliable means of ensuring non-proliferation in our area.

The example of Iraq bears out Israel's contention that the non-proliferation Treaty does not adequately address the problem in the Middle East. Indeed, the Secretary-General, in his report of 1990 to the General Assembly, had this in mind when he wrote:

> "A zone can be even more effective in this regard than the NPT, essential as that instrument and its IAEA safeguards systems are." (A/45/435, para. 109)

These particular reservations do not diminish Israel's support for the work of the Preparatory Committee, hence Israel will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.6.

Mr. CHANDRA (India): I speak in explanation of our vote on resolutions A/C.1/47/L.6 and A/C.1/47/L.18.

My delegation would like to place on record our views on nuclear non-proliferation in the context of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.6. Not being a signatory to the non-proliferation Treaty, India would abstain on this resolution.

India has consistently maintained its opposition to all nuclear weapons and has repeatedly called for the prevention of all proliferation of nuclear weapons by nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States alike. It has been

(Mr. Chandra, India)

our policy to strive for an end to proliferation in all its dimensions - horizontal, vertical and geographical - and we have given effect to this world position in our national policy. However, in our view, any approach that seeks merely to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to non-nuclear-weapon States, while creating no firm obligations on nuclear-weapon States in respect of vertical and geographical proliferation, is unequal and discriminatory and cannot be accepted as a genuine universal disarmament measure.

While the non-proliferation Treaty of 1968 places verifiable obligations on non-nuclear-weapon States, it falls far short of imposing any corresponding verifiable and binding obligations on nuclear-weapon States to reduce and to eliminate their nuclear arsenals.

(Mr. Chandra, India)

It is our belief that a genuine and universally acceptable non-proliferation regime should aim at completely arresting the production or acquisition of nuclear weapons, accompanied by a simultaneous cut-off in the production of all fissionable material for weapons purposes, by all States. In such a case all nuclear facilities would be declared peaceful and would become subject to a universal system of international safeguards, irrespective of whether they belonged to nuclear-weapon States or non-nuclear-weapon States.

The time has come for an examination by the world community of the implications of the continuation of a Treaty having an unequal character. In a few years from now, Member States that are signatories to the non-proliferation Treaty would have to decide on a fresh lease of life for the non-proliferation regime as embodied in the non-proliferation Treaty.

We submit that, given our shared commitment to preventing all proliferation of nuclear weapons by all States, as referred to in the preambular section of the non-proliferation Treaty itself, it would be wholly appropriate to begin serious negotiations towards a Treaty which can replace the existing non-proliferation Treaty. Such a treaty would give legal effect to a binding commitment by nuclear-weapon States to eliminate all nuclear weapons within an agreed time-frame and also by all non-nuclear-weapon States not to cross the nuclear-weapon threshold. Verification would be carried out through international safeguards applicable to all nuclear facilities. Our delegation remains ready to cooperate with other delegations in moving towards this shared objective.

In regard to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.18, my delegation will be pleased to vote in support of it, in conformity with our belief, as expressed

(Mr. Chandra, India)

in our statement in the First Committee's general debate, that steps should be taken to curb the trend of the arms build-up at both the national and the global level, which affects developing countries in particular in more than one way. We have welcomed the proposal to make international arms transfers more transparent through a United Nations register as proposed by resolution 46/36 L, and have contributed to the Secretary-General's report on the technical procedures and adjustments to the annex necessary for the effective operation of the United Nations register on conventional arms.

Our support of the draft decision contained in document A/C.1/47/L.3, on international arms transfers, is in pursuance of the same objectives pertaining to the illicit arms trade, which dangerously fuels destabilizing phenomena such as terrorism, subversion and drug trafficking.

In reiterating our support for draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.18, my delegation would, however, like to underscore the universal and non-discriminatory aspects of the register as is indeed specified in paragraph 7 of resolution 46/36 L, adopted by the General Assembly at its forty-sixth session. We also consider it essential - and we stress this - that the obligations assumed under the resolution be implemented simultaneously by all Member States.

Sir Michael WESTON (United Kingdom): I wish to explain the United Kingdom's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.30, on the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR).

The United Kingdom has always supported the valuable work of UNIDIR. We were happy to join the consensus on resolution 45/62 G, which requested the Institute to prepare a research report on the economic aspects of disarmament,

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

and we are grateful to the Institute for its work on this subject, which provides some useful insights.

We believe it is ambitious, however, to try to set out principles on the economics of disarmament, particularly in what is intended as a research study. Most of the so-called principles set out in the report which is the subject of this draft resolution are merely summaries of the research undertaken. As such, they provide useful points for consideration on some of the economic implications of disarmament which affect certain countries to differing degrees. They are not, however, generally applicable rules on which future development of work on this subject can be founded.

A research study should promote thought. The UNIDIR report certainly does this. Indeed it could prove a stimulating contribution to the debate on economic aspects of disarmament. However, a number of the points raised are arguable and, because of this, we do not feel able to commend, in their entirety, the set of principles laid out in the study. It is for this reason that we shall be abstaining on draft resolution L.30.

We regret that we are unable to join the consensus, since we continue to support UNIDIR. We deplore the lack of consultation on the draft resolution and the fact that the sponsors were unwilling to take account of our views.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take decisions on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 1, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.1/Rev.2.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.1/Rev.2 is entitled "Convention on the prohibition of the

(Mr. Kheradi)

development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and on their destruction". It should be noted that in connection with this draft resolution there are programme budget implications which are set out in document A/C.1/47/L.43.

In connection with those programme budget implications, I should like to draw the Committee's attention to a few technical corrections that need to be incorporated in document L.43. They are as follows.

In line 2 of paragraph 3, the word "would" should be replaced by the word "might".

In paragraph 3, in the second line of subparagraph (a), the words "in the week of" should be inserted after the words "The Hague", and the word "from" should be deleted, so that the text reads "in The Hague in the week of 8 to 12 February 1993".

In paragraph 3, in the second line of subparagraph (b), the dates shown in parenthesis, "15 January-14 July 1993", should be deleted.

(Mr. Kheradi)

In paragraph 6, second line from the end, the word "anticipated" should be inserted between the words "the" and "beginning". The phrase would then read as follows: "days of the anticipated beginning of rendering of services".

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.1/Rev.2 was introduced by the representative of Germany at the 28th meeting of the First Committee, on 10 November 1992, and is sponsored by the following countries: Afghanistan, Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, the Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, the Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, the Federated States of Micronesia, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland,

(Mr. Kheradi)

Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zaire and Zambia.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.1/Rev.2 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.1/Rev.2 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take a decision on draft decision A/C.1/47/L.3.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/47/L.3, "International arms transfers," was introduced by the representative of Colombia at the 26th meeting of the Committee, on 5 November 1992, and is sponsored by Colombia and Peru.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft decision A/C.1/47/L.3 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft decision A/C.1/47/L.3 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now turn to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.5.

I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.5, "United Nations Disarmament Fellowship, Training and Advisory Services Programme," was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the 24th meeting of the First Committee, on 3 November 1992, and is sponsored

(Mr. Kheradi)

by the following countries: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Benin, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Mali, Mongolia, Myanmar, Namibia, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Senegal, Sweden, Togo, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America, Venezuela, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.5 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.5 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.6.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.6, "Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons: 1995 Conference and its Preparatory Committee", was introduced by the representative of Peru on behalf of the States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons at the 24th meeting of the First Committee on 3 November 1992.

With reference to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.6, I wish to make the following statement on behalf of the Secretariat.

"By the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/47/L.6 concerning the 1995 Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its Preparatory Committee, the General Assembly would, inter alia, take note of the decision of the parties to the Treaty following appropriate consultations to form a Preparatory Committee for the Conference to review the operation of the Treaty and to decide on its extension.

"The Assembly would further request the Secretary-General to render the necessary assistance and to provide such services, including summary records, as may be required for the 1995 Conference and its Preparatory Committee. It should be noted that the 1995 Conference will be a conference of States parties to the Treaty. As was the case in the past, conferences on multilateral disarmament treaties - for example the sea-bed Treaty and the biological weapons Convention - included in their

(Mr. Kheradi)

rules of procedure provisions concerning the arrangements for meeting the costs of the Conference, including the sessions of the Preparatory Committee. Under those arrangements, no additional cost was borne by the regular budget of the Organization.

"Accordingly, the Secretary-General considers that his mandate under the draft resolution to provide the necessary assistance and services for the preparation and holding of the 1995 Conference has no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations and that the associated costs would be met in accordance with the financial arrangements to be made by the 1995 Conference.

"Furthermore, all activities related to international conventions or treaties that under their respective legal instruments are to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations may only be undertaken when sufficient resources to cover the activities in question have been received from the States parties in advance."

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia,

Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Cuba, India

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.6 was adopted by 133 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take a decision on draft decision A/C.1/47/L.7.*

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/47/L.7, "Conventional disarmament on a regional scale", was introduced by the representative of Peru at the 22nd meeting of the First Committee, on 29 October 1992.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft decision A/C.1/47/L.7 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft decision A/C.1/47/L.7 was adopted.

---

* Mr. Patokallio (Finland), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.8.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.8, "Guidelines and recommendations for objective information on military matters", was introduced by the representative of the United Kingdom at the 30th meeting of the First Committee on 11 November 1992. The sponsors of the draft resolution are as follows: Austria, Brazil, Cameroon, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Japan, Malaysia, Nepal, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Peru, Romania, Sweden, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Uruguay.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.8 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.8 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.10.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.10, entitled "Prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons", was introduced by the representative of the Russian Federation at the 26th meeting of the First Committee, on 5 November 1992. The list of sponsors is as follows: Belgium, Canada, the Russian Federation and Sweden.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.10 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.10 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.16.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.16, entitled "Disarmament Week", which was introduced by the representative of Mongolia at the 23rd meeting of the First Committee, on 2 November 1992, is sponsored by the following countries: Afghanistan, Belarus, Canada, China, Costa Rica, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Malaysia, the Federated States of Micronesia, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Samoa, Singapore, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkmenistan, Ukraine and Viet Nam.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.16 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committeee wishes to adopt the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.16 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.18.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.18, entitled "Transparency in armaments", has programme budget implications, which are contained in document A/C.1/47/L.44. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the Netherlands at the 25th meeting of the Committee, on 4 November 1992. It is sponsored by the following countries: Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, the Central African Republic,

(Mr. Kheradi)

Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Moldova, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, the Russian Federation, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Slovenia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Venezuela.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.18 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.18 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.20/Rev.1.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.20/Rev.1, entitled "Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques", was introduced by the representative of Australia at the 23rd meeting of the Committee, on 2 November 1992, and is sponsored by the following countries: Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bulgaria, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Finland, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Romania, the Russian Federation, Sweden, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.20/Rev.1 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.20/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.21.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.21, entitled "Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects", was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 26th meeting of the Committee, on 5 November 1992, and is sponsored by the following countries: Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Iceland, India, Ireland, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Russian Federation, Sweden and Viet Nam.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.21 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.21 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.23.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.23, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the 28th meeting of the Committee, on 10 November 1992. The sponsors of the draft resolution are Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, and Armenia.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.23 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.23 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.24, "Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in South-East Asia".

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.24 was introduced by the representative of Singapore at the 28th meeting of the First Committee, on 10 November 1992, and is sponsored by the following countries: Albania, Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, the Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, the Federated States of Micronesia, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland,

(Mr. Kheradi)

Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.24 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.24 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.27, "Study on defensive security concepts and policies".

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.27 has the following sponsors: Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Egypt, France, Germany, Greece, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Poland, the Russian Federation and Ukraine.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.27 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.27 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.28/Rev.1, "Report of the Conference on Disarmament".

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.28/Rev.1 was introduced by the representative of Belgium, as

(Mr. Kheradi)

President of the Conference on Disarmament, at the 28th meeting of the Committee, on 10 November 1992.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.28/Rev.1 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.28/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take a deicison on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.30, "United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research".

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.30 was introduced by the representative of France at the 26th meeting of the Committee, on 5 November 1992, and is sponsored by the following countries: Albania, Algeria, Armenia, Austria, Cameroon, Canada, Costa Rica, Egypt, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Italy, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nepal, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, the Russian Federation, Senegal, Singapore, Spain and Sri Lanka.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.30.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.30 was adopted by 132 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.39.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.39, entitled "World Disarmament Campaign", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 28th meeting of the Committee, on 10 November 1992, and is sponsored by the following countries: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Mexico, Myanmar, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Ukraine and Venezuela.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.39 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.39 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.42/Rev.1.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.42/Rev.1, entitled "Verification in all its aspects, including the role of the United Nations in the field of verification", was introduced by the representative of Canada at the 26th meeting of the Committee, on 5 November 1992, and is sponsored by the following countries: Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Romania, the Russian Federation, Samoa, Singapore, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and Thailand.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.42/Rev.1 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.42/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their positions or votes.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.23, again this year the United States did not participate in the voting. The United States believes that disarmament and development are two distinct issues that cannot be considered as organically linked. Consequently, the United States also did not participate in the 1987 international conference on this matter.

The United States delegation requests that the record of today's proceedings reflect the fact that the United States has not participated in the consideration of or action on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.23 on disarmament and development. At the same time, our delegation takes this opportunity to state again that the United States does not, and will not, consider itself bound by the declarations in the Final Document of the international conference.

Mr. HOU Zhitong (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese delegation just joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.1/Rev.2. In this connection, I wish to explain China's position on this draft resolution as well as on the draft Convention on chemical weapons.

Thanks to many years of negotiations and unremitting efforts made by

(Mr. Hou Zhitong, China)

all sides, the Conference on Disarmament concluded two months ago the draft international Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, thereby laying down an international legal basis for eliminating this entire category of weapons of mass destruction from the whole world.

As a non-chemical-weapon State and a victim of the scourge of foreign chemical weapons, China has consistently stood for the complete prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons and their production facilities. By attaching great importance to and taking an active part in the negotiations, we have made our contribution to the conclusion of the draft Convention. We are of the view that the present draft Convention, although not free from defects, stands for fundamentally correct purposes and objectives, namely, the complete prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons. It therefore enjoys the wide support and approval of the international community.

The full achievement of these purposes and objectives leading to a world free from chemical weapons will undoubtedly be conducive to maintaining international peace and security. Therefore, China joined the consensus on the draft Convention at the Conference on Disarmament and agreed that the draft Convention be submitted to the current session of the General Assembly for deliberation.

Today, my delegation also joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.1/Rev.2, by which the General Assembly would endorse the draft Convention on chemical weapons.

I wish to recall that under instructions from my Government, my

(Mr. Hou Zhitong, China)

delegation pointed out the following in its statement of position at the Conference on Disarmament. The present draft Convention does not reflect adequately the just demands and reasonable proposals of many developing countries, including China. It contains some defects and lacks proper balance in its provisions on a number of important issues. For example, its scope of verification of the chemical industry is too broad. As a result, an extremely large number of chemical facilities not relevant to chemical weapons are unnecessarily subject to declaration and verification. Another example is that the draft Convention places undue emphasis on making challenge inspections extremely intrusive and at short notice, but ignores the danger of abuse and the necessity of preventing abuse of the right to request such inspections.

China, like many other countries, cannot help but express its concern and reservation over such drawbacks in the draft Convention. We sincerely hope that these problems will be resolved by constructive means, thus contributing to the universality of the Convention and the early realization of its fundamental objectives.*

---

* The Chairman returned to the Chair.

Mr. YATIV (Israel): Israel supported draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.23. However, had there been a paragraph-by-paragraph vote Israel would have voted against the third preambular paragraph.

Israel supported draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.42/Rev.1. We should like, however, to reiterate our position that mutual verification arrangements agreed upon by the parties to any agreement, be it in the security or arms-control domain, are the primary vehicle to build confidence between the parties and ensure compliance.

Mr. NUNES (Portugal): With reference to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.24, "Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in South-East Asia", just adopted by consensus, Portugal would like to state the following.

We welcome the endorsement of this kind of treaty, whose aim is to promote peace and regional stability in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. We believe that in general terms such a treaty constitutes a valuable instrument for the strengthening of international understanding and cooperation.

We view South-East Asia as a particularly important and sensitive region where in the last few decades serious conflicts and confrontations have occurred, and we naturally support any initiatives which would prevent such conflicts from occurring in the future. Portugal maintains good ties of friendship and cooperation with many of the countries of that part of the world. We value these links, based in some cases on historical relations that date back many centuries, and we wish to build on them further, namely within the framework of the European Community/Association of South-East Asian Nations.

(Mr. Nunes, Portugal)

However, Portugal would like to point out the flagrant contradiction between the terms of the Treaty signed in February 1976 and the behaviour of one of its signatories, Indonesia, which, barely two months before signing the Treaty, had invaded and militarily occupied the neighbouring Non-Self-Governing Territory of East Timor and has persisted ever since in this illegal conduct, in violation of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

Mr. CHANDRA (India): I have asked to speak to place on record my delegation's views on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.8, on objective information on military matters; and on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.28/Rev.1, on the report of the Conference on Disarmament. We supported both draft resolutions and voted in the affirmative.

In regard to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.8, which has just been adopted, it should be mentioned that India participated actively in the consideration of the guidelines on objective information on military matters adopted by consensus by the United Nations Disarmament Commission in 1992.

Transparency and openness are necessary as confidence-building measures as a matter of general principle. While India supports transparency, it believes that transparency is not an end in itself nor should transparency per se become the ultimate objective. Transparency is important if it is considered as a vehicle for the achievement of the objective of general and complete disarmament.

We believe that objective information on military matters should be a universal exercise in which all States Members of the United Nations participate. For a reporting system to be useful and for it to serve the intended purpose of confidence-building, it would need to be universally complied with.

(Mr. Chandra, India)

My delegation also sees the standardized reporting system as an evolving exercise. The reporting system and format must be reviewed with a view to constant improvement and needed fine-tuning. I should like to recall that the ad hoc panel of experts which finalized the instrument in 1980 admitted in its report that some parts of the instrument might call for further examination. We believe, for example, that the reporting format should also reflect military expenditure in per capita terms and in proportion to the gross domestic product of each country in order to put the military expenditure figures in the proper perspective.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.28/Rev.1, on the report of the Conference on Disarmament, I should like to mention that India is fully committed to participation in the work of the Conference on Disarmament in its capacity as a member of this single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum of the international community. As is well known, my delegation has participated constructively and with sincerity in all the deliberations during this crucial phase of its work.

India's commitment to a global ban on the production, stockpiling, acquisition and retention of use of chemical weapons is well known. We have contributed to the efforts that have finally fructified in the realization of a global chemical weapons Convention.

The successful negotiation of the Convention is a landmark achievement and reaffirms the importance of the Conference as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum of the international community. All of us realize and accept that this is no mean achievement.

The successful completion of the work on the chemical weapons Convention, while deserving commendation, should not lull us into a sense of complacency

(Mr. Chandra, India)

about other areas of work where the Conference on Disarmament has not been quite as successful. The Conference on Disarmament has not, for instance, been able to deliver on nuclear-related issues as it was clearly required to do in accordance with the priorities in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. That is no doubt due to the absence of clearly spelt out negotiating mandates for the nuclear items on its agenda. Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.28/Rev.1, on the report of the Conference on Disarmament, has not taken this into account.

Following the completion of work on the chemical weapons Convention the question of the future of the role of the Conference on Disarmament has been posed by many. Some have endeavoured to answer it by asking for a review of the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament.

In my delegation's view any review of the agenda which was set up with such care and deliberation must include consideration of what is not on the agenda - specifically, matters which are even more important than the agenda itself, namely, negotiating mandates. There are a number of issues on the present agenda of the Conference on Disarmament which call for a forum for negotiations. The Conference on Disarmament, as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum of the international community, can be meaningful only if we consider negotiating mandates for priority items on its agenda with a view to making progress in the future. At the same time, we must guard against the temptation to be selective about our approach to the question of a negotiating mandate. My delegation has never quite understood why countries should be afraid of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament. The experience of the Conference in negotiating the chemical

(Mr. Chandra, India)

weapons Convention is proof that it can negotiate important international treaties and conventions on other agenda items before it at present. No member of the Conference on Disarmament need fear that its viewpoint will not be reflected in any negotiations. Negotiations can be held in the Conference on Disarmament in a constructive, fair and useful manner, reflecting the opinions, views and preoccupations of all concerned.

(Mr. Chandra, India)

There is no need for us to worry about life in the Conference on Disarmament after the chemical weapons Convention. The malady, if there is any, lies in excessive caution and in lack of political will to allow the Conference to fulfil its role as a negotiating forum. For those harbouring doubts about the future role of the Conference, let me venture to assure you that we could never go wrong if we were to select the most important item, namely the nuclear-test ban, for negotiations next year.

Since draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.28/Rev.1 enjoys consensus, my delegation, in the true spirit of cooperation, has gone along with it. At the same time, we have deemed it fit to put on record our views on the content of the draft resolution on the work of the Conference on Disarmament.

Mr. HU Xiaodi (China) (interpretation from Chinese): I asked to speak in order to explain our position on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.18.

Proceeding from the position of safeguarding world peace, security and stability, China has always taken a prudent and responsible attitude towards the transfer of arms; this attitude is duly reflected in our relevant policies and measures. It is precisely on the basis of such a position that we endorsed the efforts with a view to the establishment of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and participated with a constructive approach in the work of the Panel of Governmental Technical Experts on the Register of Conventional Arms. Although not totally satisfied with the Panel's report (A/47/342 and Corr.1), in the spirit of cooperation and flexibility we joined in the consensus on the rep:rt as well as on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.18.

In the meantime, we feel that in the report as it is, there remain a number of questions requiring further discussion and consultations. For

(Mr. Hu Xiaodi, China)

instance, as regards the concept of international arms transfer, the report does not cover all aspects of the matter. It also fails to list not only the aircraft used for electronic jamming warfare or for refuelling, but also the value and the model of the transferred arms, with the result that the Register cannot reflect fully the quantity and quality of the weapons transferred.

Furthermore, the report has not given adequate attention to the security needs of those countries that rely mainly on imports for their weapons. We hope that these problems will be resolved in the process of implementation and consultation. We are of the view that, as arms transparency bears on the security of all countries, we should be very prudent in exploring relevant measures. It is imperative that such measures follow the principles of justice, rationality and practicality and be universally accepted by all parties concerned, while nothing should compromise the security of any country, particularly the interests of small- and medium-sized countries.

Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan): I would like to explain Pakistan's position on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.1/Rev.2, on chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons.

Pakistan's reservations and concerns on the draft texts of the chemical weapons Convention submitted by the Conference on Disarmament to the United Nations General Assembly for its consideration were explained in the Conference itself on 3 September 1992 and are incorporated in the report of the Conference (A/47/27, para. 73 (21)).

Briefly, Pakistan neither possesses chemical weapons nor desires to acquire them. We have always had a deep and abiding interest in a comprehensive, effective and equitable treaty, that would prohibit the

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

development, stockpiling, acquisition and use of chemical weapons and ensure the total destruction of existing stockpiles, facilities and delivery systems for them. Our commitment to conclude the Convention banning chemical weapons is predicated on our desire to exclude any possibility of the acquisition or retention of this abhorrent means of warfare by any country, and particularly by developing countries situated in regions of tension. In such countries, the competing demands of national security and socio-economic development on scarce available resources compel them to allocate ever-larger outlays for defence, thereby reducing their capacity to provide inputs for essential social and developmental projects. By eliminating one avenue of defence expenditure for such countries, we would be helping them break out of the vicious circle of insecurity, spiralling arms levels and underdevelopment.

Pakistan participated actively in the negotiations on the drafting of the chemical weapons Convention. However, the results have not been entirely satisfactory. The draft text of the Convention contains provisions - particularly with reference to non-relevant facilities and locations - that have the potential for great misuse and abuse, thereby undermining confidence in the future Convention. Our particular concerns in this regard relate to articles II, VI and IX. The definition of chemical weapons contained in article II is extremely wide, lacks precision and contains elements that can easily be exploited to misuse and abuse the provisions of the Convention. Provisions relating to verification and compliance, as contained in articles VI and IX, constitute the backbone of the Convention, as they would establish the means of providing confidence in its implementation and in deterring violations of its provisions. In establishing such a system of

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

verification, it was necessary that a proper balance be struck between the requirements of intrusiveness and deterrence on the one hand, and safeguards against abusive procedures on the other. It is regrettable that this balance was not achieved, and that we are faced with a text in which intrusiveness and deterrence have been accorded a much higher priority than safeguards against abuse. This shortcoming has been confounded further by emasculation of the potential of the Executive Council to play its due role in overseeing the implementation of the provisions of article IX.

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

Other loopholes also cause us concern. Among these is an unnecessary extension of the possible destruction period for existing stocks from 10 years to 15 years, which places non-holders at increased risk for an avoidable extra period of five years. Similarly, verification procedures in articles 6 and 9 against possible acquistion of chemical weapons are not matched by an equivalent role in the provision of assistance under article 10 in cases of actual use, such assistance being left to be provided under the discretion of the individual parties without being automatic, which is essential in such cases.

Nevertheless, as it now stands, the draft Convention on chemical weapons, however imperfect it might be and in however an imperfect manner it might have been prepared, is now unfortunately the only draft we have in our hands. Success for its future will now have to be secured, not by a better drafting of its contents, for that is no longer realistically possible, but by a more intelligent application of its provisions. An enormous burden would now be put on the preparatory phase of this Convention, where some of the outstanding issues will have to be resolved, implementation procedures will have to be cautiously worked out in detail, and temptations will have to be jointly resisted against succumbing to extraneous considerations which might lead to an unbalanced and undemocratic allocation of seats in the different decision-making organs under the Convention.

Our views regarding the formula for the composition of the Executive Council are well known. We favour the principle of equitable geographical distribution and believe that each geographic group has the right to nominate its members to the Executive Council using criteria it deems most appropriate.

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

While the industrial criterion is certainly an important consideration for membership of the Executive Council it cannot be placed on a higher plane than other criteria, which differ from region to region. We cannot in any case accept the concept of permanent seats in the Executive Council. It should be left to States of each region to take these different considerations into account while nominating members of the Executive Council.

For all these reasons, despite our reservations and concerns and in the interest of a constructive and forward-looking approach on a Convention with deep security implications, Pakistan has decided, as it did in the Conference on Disarmament itself, not to stand in the way of a consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.1/Rev. 2.

My delegation has also joined the consensus on resolution A/C.1/47/L.8 entitled "Guidelines and recommendations for objective information on military matters". In a spirit of compromise and cooperation my delegation has also joined the consensus on the adoption of the report of the Disarmament Commission on this subject at its 1992 session. However, we would like to place on record the following in explanation of vote.

Pakistan has always supported in principle the ultimate objective of the proposal regarding objective information on military matters. However, in our view the collection of information on military matters concerning all States could create potential problems for smaller and militarily weaker States. The availability of information on military matters through an international reporting system can work against the security interests of such smaller States. While these States may not essentially benefit from the information they receive regarding the military capability of bigger States, information conerning themselves as smaller and weaker States could be used to their

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

disadvantage by bigger States seeking regional or global hegemony and influence. The wide disparity between the armaments expenditure of militarily strong States and other relatively weaker States cannot be justified either. The reduction in military budgets should therefore be initiated by those States which possess the largest military arsenals. We have also to bear in mind that the accumulation of armaments in various regions of the world is the result of a number of factors - unresolved territorial disputes, denial of the right to self-determination, ambitions for regional hegemony by States possessing military superiority, and foreign occupation and military intervention.

One of the most important issues to be addressed is therefore the underlying causes of outstanding disputes and conflicts. Only thus will proposals for the provision of objective information on military matters and transparency in armaments succeed in their essential objective and the process of regional and international peace and security be strengthened.

My delegation has also, in a spirit of constructive cooperation, joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.17 entitled "Transparency in armaments". Pakistan fully supports the concept of transparency in armaments as long as it helps in enhancing confidence-building between States, particularly at the regional level, and with the ultimate objective of ensuring equal and undiminished security of States at the lowest level of armaments. Transparency in armaments can have one kind of effect when the parties involved have a rough military balance and another kind of effect if there is a vast disparity between two sides. The concept of equilibrium is extremely relevant in ensuring that transparency in armaments leads to enhanced security. In dealing with the issue of the United Nations Register

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

of Conventional Arms one should not overlook the fundamental objective of the whole exercise, which is to encourage arms control and disarmament with a view to strengthening international and regional peace and stability at the lowest level of armaments.

Attention only to the superficial, in disregard of the fundamental, would be a recipe for disaster. Ideally, due attention should be paid to both. Thus, together with transparency in armaments the international community must also as a priority matter seek to encourage and support the steps which would lead to the creation of an environment conducive to meaningful arms control and disarmament without jeopardizing the security interests of the States concerned. These include firstly, the settlement of outstanding differences and disputes through peaceful means, in accordance with the principles and purposes of the Charter and the relevant United Nations resolutions on the subject; secondly, the renunciation by regional States of policies of domination, hegemony or coercion or the threat or use of force in any form whatsoever; thirdly, negotiations among regional States for equitable and balanced reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons, ensuring equal and undiminished security for all States at the lowest level of armaments and armed forces; fourthly, agreements amongst regional States on restrictions and limitations on force deployments and movements; and, fifthly and finally, arrangements at global and regional levels for the total prohibition or elimination of weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons.

In operative paragraph 4 of that draft resolution, all Member States are called upon to provide the requested data and information. In our view it is the responsibility of the major arms supplier countries to take the lead in

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

reporting on arms transfers. Only thus would proposals for transparency in armaments succeed in their essential objective and the process of regional and international peace and security be strengthened.

Mr. RIVERO ROSARIO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): The Cuban delegation would like first to make a brief statement on the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, whose text has been approved by the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.1/Rev. 2.

(Mr. Rivero Rosario, Cuba)

In keeping with Cuba's position on the prohibition and total elimination of chemical weapons, our country has been working intensively over the past years in the context of the Conference on Disarmament to contribute to the negotiating process that took place in that forum. In accordance with that line of thought and action, Cuba joined the group of countries that sponsored the draft resolution accompanying the Convention and has been participating in the process of consultations on the establishment of the Preparatory Commission for the future Organization on the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons.

The delegation of Cuba wishes today to express the full readiness of the Government of Cuba to join the Convention and therefore Cuba intends to sign the Convention when it is opened for signature on 13 January in Paris. That decision falls within the context of Cuba's position on the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction and in favour of disarmament and peace.

My delegation also wishes to explain its position on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/47/L.18, entitled "Transparency in armaments". As will be recalled, the delegation of Cuba abstained last year when resolution 46/36 L was put to a vote. We did so, inter alia, because although we were not opposed to the establishment of a Register of Conventional Arms, we felt that to ensure an adequate balance and to avoid the inclusion of any discriminatory aspects, the Register should refer not just to the transfer of armaments but also to elements such as domestic production, stockpiling and transfer of technology for the production of weapons, and so on.

On this occasion, we joined the consensus requested by the sponsors, bearing in mind that the draft resolution submitted is basically a procedural text based on work done by the Group of Experts on the study prepared, which -

(Mr. Rivero Rosario, Cuba)

as our delegation noted in its statement on 22 October - suggests that a new aproach to the Register is emerging with a view to broadening its scope and that that approach should take hold in the deliberations and activities of the new working group to be established in 1994. The foregoing notwithstanding, we would have preferred the text of the draft resolution to express more emphatically the actions requested of Member States and the Conference on Disarmament in operative paragraphs 5 and 8 respectively. We also feel that, in the light of the expansion arising from the adjustments made to the categories of armaments in the annex to the Register, it would have been appropriate in the relevant paragraph to reiterate the determination of the General Assembly to prevent excessive and destabilizing accumulation of arms, including conventional weapons, so as to promote stability and strengthen regional or international peace and security, taking into account the legitimate security needs of States and the principle of undiminished security at the lowest possible level of armaments.

As to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/47/L.27 on the question of defensive security concepts and policies and the study prepared, my delegation sees it as a major contribution that should be the focus of the particular attention of all States. We should like to refer specifically to the fourth preambular paragraph, which includes the idea that initiatives on preventive diplomacy contribute to the strengthening of international peace and security. The concept of preventive diplomacy is a new one in its definition and content. What it involves is the subject of the work of a working group which, in the context of the plenary, is discussing the report submitted by the Secretary-General entitled "An Agenda for Peace". The support of the delegation of Cuba expressed for draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.27

(Mr. Rivero Rosario, Cuba)

should not be considered as a revalidation of the concept of preventive diplomacy, nor should it prejudge the position which, in the context of the work of the aforementioned working group, our delegation may maintain.

Mr. BARBOSA (Cape Verde) (interpretation from French): I have asked to speak in order to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.24, which has just been adopted. My delegation would have liked to join the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.24 on the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in South-East Asia. Indeed, we believe that the fact that this draft resolution was sponsored by such a large number of countries eloquently demonstrates the great importance the international community, and Cape Verde in particular, attach to treaties of this nature as instruments for enhancing the regional confidence so necessary to the restoration of regional and international peace and security. The cordial relationship between my country and the signatories to that Treaty is a further element inspiring this very sincere desire on the part of my country.

Unfortunately, we are compelled to note in particular that, despite the fact that the fifth preambular paragraph states that:

> "Noting further that the purpose of the Treaty is to promote perpetual peace [and] ... mutual respect for the independence ... of all nations ...",

this purpose has not been respected or pursued in the case of East Timor. The situation is quite to the contrary. It is for that reason that my delegation was unable to join the sponsors.

We were, however, in favour of the adoption of the draft resolution so as to demonstrate our solidarity and contribute to the noble cause of promoting peace and stability and the development of the South-East Asian region. This

(Mr. Barbosa, Cape Verde)

favourable position also necessarily implies my country's wish to see the people of East Timor - to which my country is linked by cultural and historic ties - exercise its inalienable right to self-determination as soon as possible. This is an objective to which all signatory countries, if they wish to be faithful to the spirit and letter of the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation, must give all their support.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): The United States abstained in the voting on this year's draft resolution on the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR), contained in document A/C.1/47/L.30, which welcomes and commends the UNIDIR report on economic principles of disarmament because we disagree with some of the principles contained in that report.

For instance, Principle 9 claims that military research and development create pressures for increased defence spending. We think that this is not correct. We recognize that this report was requested by the General Assembly, and we would have been happy to join a consensus on a draft resolution noting the report. Unfortunately, however, the draft resolution contains language that goes much further and gives the impression of United Nations endorsement of the principles contained in that report. My authorities do not wish to be associated with giving such an impression. Furthermore, we consider it to be highly inappropriate for United Nations resolutions selectively to endorse UNIDIR reports.

(Mr. Ledogar, United States)

Despite specific problems with the UNIDIR report, my authorities chose to abstain rather than to vote against the draft resolution. As they have generally supported the work of UNIDIR and continue to defend the concept upon which UNIDIR is based - that of extending additional opportunities to authors to produce studies reflecting their individual views on various disarmament issues - we hope that UNIDIR will continue its work in that tradition and that the General Assembly, including the First Committee, will respect that tradition.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to remind members of the Committee that the deadline for submission of draft resolutions under agenda items 67 and 69 is today, Thursday, 12 November, at 6 p.m.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.